

INCONSISTENCY OF CANONICALLY QUANTIZED $N=1$ SUPERGRAVITY? *

Don N. Page
CIAR Cosmology Program
Theoretical Physics Institute
Department of Physics
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada T6G 2J1
Internet: don@page.phys.ualberta.ca

1993 June 4

Abstract

D'Eath's proof that there can be at most two allowed quantum states of $N = 1$ supergravity with zero or a finite number of fermions can be extended to show that there are no such states.

PACS numbers: 04.60.+n, 04.65.+e, 98.80.Dr

* Alberta Thy-28-93, hep-th/9306032

The canonical (Dirac) quantization of $N = 1$ supergravity [1] applies Lorentz and supersymmetry constraints

$$J^{AB}\Psi = \bar{J}^{A'B'}\Psi = S^A\Psi = \bar{S}^{A'}\Psi = 0 \quad (1)$$

to a wavefunctional Ψ of the spatial tetrad $e^{AA'}_i(x)$ and of one-half of the spatial gravitino field, say $\psi^A_i(x)$. D'Eath [2] argued that since the supersymmetry constraints do not mix fermion number, one can study separately the states with definite fermion numbers. Furthermore, for a nonzero finite number of fermions, he noted that the two supersymmetry constraints are inconsistent, so that only bosonic states are allowed. Finally, D'Eath showed that only two bosonic states are possibly allowed, of the form $e^{\pm I}$ for a certain action functional I of the three-geometry.

Bosonic wavefunctionals either have the form $\Psi(e^{AA'}_i(x), \psi^A_i(x))$ with no dependence on the $\psi^A_i(x)$ half of the spatial gravitino field, or they have the fermionic Fourier transform [1] $\tilde{\Psi}(e^{AA'}_i(x), \tilde{\psi}^{A'}_i(x))$ with no dependence on the other half, $\tilde{\psi}^{A'}_i(x)$, of the spatial gravitino field. In the former case, the supersymmetry constraint can be written as [2]

$$\Psi^{-1}\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi \equiv \epsilon^{ijk}e_{AA'i}({}^3sD_j\psi^A_k) - \frac{1}{2}\hbar\kappa^2\psi^A_i\frac{\delta(\ln\Psi)}{\delta e^{AA'}_i} = 0. \quad (2)$$

D'Eath derived a formula, Eq. (24) of [2], for the variation of $\ln\Psi$ produced by a variation of the spatial tetrad $e^{AA'}_i(x)$. However, one can readily see that although this may make $\delta(\ln\Psi)/\delta e^{AA'}_i$ satisfy Eq. (2) for *some* possible spatial gravitino field configurations $\psi^A_i(x)$, it cannot possibly satisfy Eq. (2) for *all* $\psi^A_i(x)$. In particular, fixing a bosonic wavefunctional $\Psi(e^{AA'}_i(x))$, fixing the tetrad field $e^{AA'}_i(x)$, fixing the variation $\delta e^{AA'}_i$, and fixing $\psi^A_i(x)$ at the one point x fixes the second term of $\Psi^{-1}\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi$ in Eq. (2) at that point. However, this still allows freedom to choose the 3-dimensional covariant derivative ${}^3sD_j\psi^A_k$ of the arbitrary fermionic field $\psi^A_k(x)$ at the point x , so that generically the first term of $\Psi^{-1}\bar{S}_{A'}\Psi$ would not cancel the second term. Therefore, Eq. (2) has no bosonic solutions (Ψ independent of ψ^A_k) for all ψ^A_k .

A precisely analogous argument applies to $S_A \Psi = 0$ for the other type of bosonic wavefunctional, $\tilde{\Psi}(e^{AA'}_i(x), \tilde{\psi}^{A'}_i(x))$ independent of $\tilde{\psi}^{A'}_i(x)$. Thus it appears that both types of bosonic wavefunctionals are inconsistent with the supersymmetry constraints. When this result is combined with D'Eath's argument [2] against states with a finite nonzero number of fermions, we see that all quantum wavefunctionals of $N = 1$ supergravity with a finite (zero or nonzero) number of fermions are inconsistent with the supersymmetry constraints.

It is tempting to conclude from these results that canonically quantized $N = 1$ supergravity is inconsistent. However, D'Eath warns [2], "The case with an infinite number of fermions might of course be different." It would be interesting to see whether the arguments can be extended to that case. Naively one would not expect a time-dependent geometry to produce purely a bounded number of fermions, since there should be an amplitude to produce an arbitrarily large number. On the other hand, at least if the theory were finite without renormalization, one would also expect finite amplitudes for components of the wavefunctional with finite numbers of fermions. By D'Eath's arguments and the additional argument above, these components would be decoupled from each other, and each would apparently be inconsistent, unless somehow their inconsistency were canceled by terms from the components with an arbitrarily large or infinite number of fermions. Or, it might turn out that the physical states are entirely concentrated on components with an infinite number of fermions. In that case it would appear that one would need a more sophisticated mathematical formulation of the canonically quantized theory.

One might also consider the possibility that $N = 1$ supergravity should not be canonically quantized in the standard way [1], or that perhaps it can be quantized only in a noncanonical way. $N = 1$ supergravity might be a theory that cannot be consistently quantized, or it might be a theory whose consistent quantization teaches us interesting lessons about canonical or other methods of quantization. In either case, we may have much to learn from this theory.

Acknowledgments: The hospitality of William and Barbara Saxton at their home in State College, Pennsylvania, where the first draft of this paper was written, is gratefully acknowledged. Discussions and correspondence with Peter D'Eath (starting at the Journées Relativistes '93 at the Université Libre de Bruxelles, and with one fax kindly sent for me by Penn State University) have been very helpful. Financial support was provided in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

References

- [1] P.D. D'Eath, *Phys. Rev. D* **29**, 2199 (1984).
- [2] P.D. D'Eath, "Physical States in $N = 1$ Supergravity" (University of Cambridge report, hep-th/9304084, April 1993).